

but I am glad he made the journey. We did not find the weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, which we were so sure were there. Even JOHN EDWARDS and JOHN KERRY, Bill Clinton, and many of the leading Democrats who are so critical of this administration said 2 years ago there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

But aside from that, what we did find is nearly 400 mass graves of citizens who had disappeared from their families. We found women who had been raped, husbands and brothers who had disappeared, forced to join an Army or had their tongue cut out for saying the wrong thing. We found a very oppressed people. We have liberated those people.

I believe what we have done in Iraq, we made the right decision, and I am very proud of the soldiers that are over there and the ones who have come home have done the job.

I am proud to represent the 3rd Infantry that was so much a part of the campaign in the Euphrates River last year. I believe the worst thing we can do in Washington now, in the name of partisan politics, is to try to erode this victory in order to gain the White House.

I hope we will all come together today and support this very important resolution in support of our troops.

MARKING THE ONE-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as true as my friend from Georgia has just said, we are about to begin consideration of a very important resolution. It is one which I believe should, in fact, enjoy strong bipartisan support. It is non-controversial in that it is designed simply to, as the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) said last night before the Committee on Rules, provide commendation to our troops and to the Iraqi people and to the coalition forces for the fact that a year ago this week they began this effort to bring about the liberation of the people of Iraq, and there has been tremendous success.

We often hear of the negatives, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is important, as Secretary Donald Rumsfeld has pointed out time and time again, we are seeing schools rebuilt. We are seeing all kinds of very, very positive developments, even though we deal with some serious challenges.

So, Mr. Speaker, my message as we prepare for consideration of this rule, which will be debated for an hour and then we will have 4 hours of debate which will allow for a wide range of views to come forward, I hope that at the end of the day, the United States House of Representatives will stand firmly behind our troops and this effort which we mark the anniversary of right now.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 557, RELATING TO THE LIBERATION OF THE IRAQI PEOPLE AND THE VALIANT SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AND COALITION FORCES

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 561 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 561

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 557) relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces. The resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to final adoption without intervening motion except: (1) four hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations or their designee; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of House Resolution 557 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the resolution to a time designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Fort Lauderdale (Mr. HASTINGS) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, our brave servicemen and -women began a military operation that brought freedom for tens of millions, toppled one of the most despicable regimes in the history of the world, and strengthened the national security for the American people.

Operation Iraqi Freedom was, and continues to be, a military success of the highest order. Within 4 weeks from the start of operations on March 19 of last year, the U.S. military had won unqualified victory. Saddam Hussein and his Baathist regime could no longer terrorize the Iraqi people who were finally free to act, do and say as they pleased for the first time in decades.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that Saddam Hussein endangered world security. He posed a threat to his people, his region and the international community. Trusting the intentions of a man who started two wars, gassed his own people, and supported international terrorism would have been grossly irresponsible.

As weapons inspector David Kay has said, we know Saddam Hussein wanted weapons of mass destruction, we know he was attempting to resuscitate his il-

licit programs, and we know with certainty who he viewed his greatest enemy to be.

In a world where Iran can buy its way to a nuclear program with assistance from Pakistan's top nuclear scientist, combined with Saddam's access to illicit oil revenue, the fact that weapons of mass destruction have not yet been found in Iraq is hardly proof that Saddam Hussein did not want to severely hurt our country. Moreover, American national security has been solidified by the military action that was undertaken last year.

Mr. Speaker, does anyone really believe that Iran would be cooperating with international nuclear inspectors today if we had not launched this military operation? Does anyone really believe that North Korea would be engaged in six-party talks over the future of their nuclear program if the United States had not deposed Saddam Hussein? Does anyone really believe that Muammar Qaddafi, as recalcitrant in his defiance to the international community as ever a dictator has been, would have willingly come to the United States and Britain and declared that he wanted to end his illicit weapons programs had the American military not marched into Baghdad?

Mr. Speaker, Operation Iraqi Freedom sent an unmistakable signal to the rest of the world's tyrannical leaders: Either play by the rules or face the consequences.

Now, the events of September 11 taught us that we cannot allow threats to arrive on our shores before we combat them. If other Nations wish to keep their head in the sand about the dangers of proliferation and terrorism, that is their prerogative, but we cannot and could not afford to take that chance.

To those who complain of the cost of war and its aftermath, I simply will note that estimates of the cost of containing Saddam and his successors, as some have argued we should have done, are upwards of six times the dollar amount we have spent on war and reconstruction thus far, and significantly higher in terms of human lives lost.

Because of the heroic action of our military, the Iraqi threat has been mitigated efficiently and a new dawn has begun for the people of Iraq.

Earlier this month, Iraqi leaders signed the transitional administrative law into effect. It establishes an Iraqi law, a bill of fundamental human rights and paves the way for Iraqi democracy.

Perhaps more important than the signing of the law itself, was the agreement of Suni, Shiite, and Kurdish leaders to sign the document. While differences amongst them remain, and the road ahead will be difficult, it is clear they are acting with the best interests of the new Iraq and its people firmly in mind.

I should say our colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is going to, in her remarks today, tell a

very moving story about the fact that these very, very disparate groups have been able to come together sharing this pursued goal.

The Iraqi people themselves are clearly enjoying their newfound freedoms under the transitional government. Poll results released just yesterday demonstrate that not only do a significant majority of Iraqis feel they are much better off than they were under Saddam Hussein's reign, but the extremely high level of participation in the poll demonstrates their desire to exercise their right to speak their minds, something that was unthinkable under the tyranny of Saddam Hussein.

□ 1030

Such progress has only been possible because of the tireless commitment of our Armed Forces and those of the 34 nations assisting us to provide security on the ground in Iraq.

It is dangerous territory; and the forces of evil, whether they be Ba'athist remnants or infiltrated al-Qaeda sympathizers, are a constant threat. In the past year, we have lost over 550 of our best and brightest Americans, with another 3,190 wounded. That number, as it is in any conflict, is too high. Without question, we owe the soldiers we have lost, the soldiers who remain, and their families, an enormous debt of gratitude. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what this resolution marking this first anniversary is designed to do. If there is any solace, it is knowing that because of their actions, America and the world are safer places today with Saddam Hussein's regime dismantled.

Because of our military, the people of Iraq have a bright future, where Sunni, Shiite, and Kurd alike can dream of being treated equally, of electing their representatives, of owning a prosperous business, and being free to say, worship, and read what they want.

Mr. Speaker, it would be all too easy for the United States to leave Iraq now and let the Iraqi people fend for themselves. Avoiding conflict is the path of least resistance and is always politically expedient. But unlike previous conflict, terrorism cannot be contained. It has no boundaries. It has no rules. One day it strikes Baghdad, the next Madrid. The only recipe for success in this war is our resolve to defeat threats where we see them and promote democracy where we can.

Mr. Speaker, true success in the war on terror is taking place right now on the ground in Baghdad and Kabul. By supporting, securing, and strengthening the democratic governments of Iraq and Afghanistan, we are promoting greater equality within those countries as well as providing forums for those who feel disaffected to air their grievances without picking up arms. As open and transparent governments spread throughout the world, the precursor ingredients for terrorism, anger, and fanaticism will dissipate.

That will be the continuing legacy of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this rule and the underlying resolution, which not only affirms the actions that the United States undertook a year ago, but provides every Member of this body the opportunity to reaffirm their own personal commitment to winning the war against terrorism, our commitment to democracy in Iraq, and, most important, to our troops in the field.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this resolution will enjoy strong bipartisan support. That is our goal. I also hope, Mr. Speaker, that as soon as we pass this resolution that we will immediately have it translated in Arabic so that Saddam Hussein can read it in his cell and be reminded constantly of what we and the victims are regularly reminded of. Thanks to our military, Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein does have time to read that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, my very good friend, that I thank him for yielding me this time, and had it been intended that this would be a bipartisan resolution, then Members in the minority would have been included in drafting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I truly wish that I could support this rule. National security is a bipartisan, or actually a nonpartisan, issue. And when we commend the troops, all of us, all of us have a stake. Every congressional district has a stake in commending the troops.

As a matter of fact, small town and rural America have furnished 46 percent and 43 percent of the deaths in Afghanistan and in Iraq. So all of us, whether we are from small towns or large cities, have a stake in a resolution commending the troops, and we should have been consulted about it. I am sorry for that.

Now, more than that, while we commend the troops, I would also have, had I been consulted, recommended that we do our best to protect our troops by including more body armor and extra up-armored Humvees, of which we still do not have enough in Iraq. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I received from the United States Army a letter indicating that there are unfunded requirements for the extra up-armored Humvees and the body armor, which is so necessary.

I would also have recommended that we have complete, timely, and high-quality health care to treat the wounds and injuries for those who have served, and to recognize those who pay the sacrifice, whether it be in wounds, injuries, or, sadly, deaths.

I would also have recognized the contributions of and the sacrifices of the families of our servicemen and -women, particularly in the Guard and Reserve. I would have recognized the efforts to improve our intelligence gaps that our troops need and so that they be better protected in the future. And I would have recognized and recommended the sufficient up-front funding for our military operations so we can ensure the safety and well-being of our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I would also have included the fact that there should have been better planning for the postwar period. I sent two letters to the President, one on September 4, 2002, and another 2 days before the attack on Iraq, both of which I include in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I think that all of us should have been at least brought to the table and all of us had an opportunity to write this resolution. I am so proud of our troops, whether they be from Missouri or Maine or wherever they are from. This is the best military our country has ever seen. And I think every Member of Congress, both sides of the aisle, should have had the opportunity to say thank you, we are proud of you, and God bless you.

Mr. Speaker, here follows the letters to which I referred earlier in my comments:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, September 4, 2002.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you for inviting me to the briefing this morning. I share your concern about the continuing threat posed by Saddam Hussein and his efforts to produce weapons of mass destruction (WMD). I would like to offer my assistance as the administration considers how to deal with this threat.

Before Congress can authorize any military action that might be part of the administration's plan, we must have answers to more questions than were able to be raised at today's meeting. Our constitutional duty requires us to ensure that all implications of such action are considered in advance. The case has not yet been fully made as to what the threat is, why military force is an appropriate way of addressing the threat, and why action must occur now. In short, Congress and the American people must be clear on your strategic vision before we can authorize a specific course of action. I believe, like Clausewitz, that in strategy there is an "imperative . . . not to take the first step without considering the last."

Your strategy for dealing with Iraq must address the fundamental questions of the threat, the method of acting, and the timing. Furthermore, any strategy to eliminate Iraqi WMD must also address several component issues, each of which raises critical questions.

1. How to manage Iraq's transition to a stable post-Saddam regime

As I mentioned to you this morning, this is a crucial question for administration strategy to answer in advance of any military action. I have no doubt that our military would decisively defeat Iraq's forces and remove Saddam. But like the proverbial dog chasing the car down the road, we must consider what we would do after we caught it.

As Sun-Tzu said in the classic strategic treatise, *The Art of War*, "To win victory is

easy; to preserve its fruits, difficult." Military planners and political leaders alike knew this in World War II. Planning for the occupation of Germany and Japan—two economically viable, technologically sophisticated nations—took place well in advance of the end of the war. The extreme difficulty of occupying Iraq with its history of autocratic rule, its balkanized ethnic tensions, and its isolated economic system argues both for careful consideration of the benefits and risks of undertaking military action and for detailed advanced occupation planning if such military action is approved.

Specifically, your strategy must consider the form of a replacement regime and take seriously the possibility that this regime might be rejected by the Iraqi people, leading to civil unrest and even anarchy. The effort must be to craft a stable regime that will be geopolitically preferable to Saddam and will incorporate the disparate interests of all groups within Iraq—Shi'a, Sunni, and Kurd. We must also plan now for what to do with members of the Baath party that continue to support Saddam and with the scientists and engineers who have expertise born of the Iraqi WMD program.

All these efforts require careful planning and long-term commitment of manpower and resources. The American people must be clear about the amount of money and the number of soldiers that will have to be devoted to this effort for many years to come.

2. How to ensure the action in Iraq does not undermine international support for the broader war on terrorism

In planning for military operations in Iraq, we cannot ignore the lack of international support to date. Pre-emptive action against Iraq is currently vocally opposed by many of our allies and friends throughout the world and particularly in the Middle East.

When we are seen as acting against the concerns of large numbers of our friends, it calls into question the "humble" approach to international relations you espoused during the presidential campaign. More than that, it has several potentially damaging long-term consequences. First, it risks losing the large number of partners needed to prosecute the global war on terrorism. To ferret terrorists groups out of their many hiding places, we must have broad allied support. Second, it risks seriously damaging U.S. moral legitimacy, potentially providing states like India and Pakistan with a pre-emptive option that could drive long-standing conflicts beyond containable bounds.

Finally and perhaps most dangerously, actions without broad Arab support may inflame the sources of terrorism, causing unrest and anger throughout the Muslim world. This dynamic will be worse if Iraq attacks Israel—perhaps with weapons of mass destruction—and draws them into the conflict. Iran, which has the potential to seize a reformist path, may well move away from the United States in the face of attacks that could next be taken against them. Together, these dynamics will make achieving peace in the Middle East more difficult and may well provide the rationale for more terrorist attacks against Americans.

These concerns do not make military action in Iraq untenable. They do, however, highlight the depth and importance of the issues to be addressed before we strike. We need to ensure that in taking out Saddam, we don't win the battle and lose the war.

3. How to ensure that the United States can execute this operation successfully as well as its other military missions

As you are well aware, Mr. President, the consideration of military action against Iraq comes at a time when U.S. forces are actively engaged throughout the world in a

range of missions. Given the operational pressures these forces currently face, we must ask what the risks and trade-offs will be of defeating Iraq, particularly if Iraqi forces mass in Baghdad for urban operations. How many casualties must the American people be prepared to take in a worst-case scenario? What will the impact of sustained operations be on so-called high-demand, low-density assets? What military operations might we have to forego because of continued demands in Iraq? Will we still be prepared for the range of other threats that might emerge throughout the world? With little allied support and contributions, will we still be able to maintain military spending on transformational technologies and on sound quality of life for our forces if we are bearing a huge wartime cost alone? What will be the impact on the domestic economy of these resources drains and of the long-term costs of reconstructing Iraq? These questions must be answered before any military action commences so that the American people understand the risks and the sacrifices involved.

I ask these questions only to highlight the complexity of the undertaking and the need for Congress, the American people, and our friends around the world to understand exactly what is at stake and why we must act now. Only such a comprehensive strategic approach will ensure that we commit U.S. troops consciously and with full knowledge of the range of challenges we face—both in the initial campaign and in the long aftermath to follow. Even a strategy that has military action as its centerpiece will require great diplomatic efforts to ensure its success. I look forward to hearing the administration's answers and to working with you to find the best course of action.

Sincerely,

IKE SKELTON,
Ranking Democrat.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, March 18, 2003.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is a critical week for our nation and for the world. As you prepare to make the most difficult decision of sending our troops into combat, the thoughts and prayers of all Americans are with you. My colleagues here in Congress have many different views on the wisdom of action in Iraq and the severity of its consequences. But we are united in our support for all the men and women who serve this nation.

There is no doubt that our forces will be victorious in any conflict, but there is great potential for a ragged ending to a war as we deal with the aftermath. I appreciate the efforts that members of your administration have made to keep me informed about plans for the administration and reconstruction of Iraq following military conflict. Your team has thought about many of the things that will need to be done.

Secretary Rumsfeld frequently talks about the list he keeps of things that could go wrong in an Iraq war. I have kept my own list—of things that could go wrong after the war is over. This list below is indicative of this broader list. My hope is that this will be helpful to members of your administration as you continue to plan for all possibilities. These are not complete scenarios but rather a series of possible problems that could occur in some combination.

INTERNAL DIVISIONS AND EXTERNAL
INFLUENCES IN IRAQ

Without access to Iraq through Turkey, U.S. troops are not present in northern Iraq

in large numbers. Turkey enters northern Iraq to establish a buffer zone and fighting breaks out between the Turks and Kurds. A significant U.S. military force is needed to separate the groups, complicating the governmental transition and international support.

An uprising in Kirkuk leaves the Kurds in control of areas of the city and surrounding area. This triggers a large Turkish invasion to protect the Turkmen minority and to prevent Kurdish control of oil resources. Again this would require U.S. military resources with all the attending effects.

In the event that Turkey crosses into Iraq, Iran may do the same, ostensibly to stem the refugee flows from southern Iraq and to protect Shi'a interests. Shi'a populations in the south rebel and undertake attacks against Sunnis. U.S. troops must step in to protect the Sunnis and restore peace. These tensions resurface during attempts to build a federal and representative government.

Urban fighting in the south brings Shi'a into conflict with Sunnis. The resulting devastation causes a refugee crisis as Shi'a make for the Iranian border. The results of Saddam's policy of forced Arabization of areas like Kirkuk yield dangerous consequences. Groups like the Kurds flow back into these areas seeking to reclaim their former homes and land, sparking conflict with Iraqi Arabs.

Attempts to fashion a federal government in Baghdad prove difficult. Iran is able to establish proxies for its influence among the Shi'a representatives. Once in Iraq, infighting breaks out among members of the former Iraqi opposition in exile. The United States is unable to transition the administration of Iraq effectively and has to remain in place, with significant military backing.

The war involves lengthy urban combat, particularly in Baghdad. Most infrastructure is destroyed resulting in massive humanitarian problems. The emphasis on humanitarian aid distracts from efforts to establish a new government. Once established the government faces massive political pressure from the sustained humanitarian crisis.

WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Saddam uses biological and chemical weapons against advancing U.S. troops, but also inflicts substantial civilian casualties. Efforts to stabilize cities and to establish a government are complicated by the need to deal with the large number of dead and to decontaminate affected areas.

Saddam uses biological and chemical weapons directly against civilian populations or against another Arab country and seeks to affix blame for civilian suffering to the United States. Over the period of occupation, this resentment complicates U.S. efforts to maintain support for reconstruction efforts.

U.S. troops are unable to quickly find all of Saddam's capabilities, requiring a long, labor-intensive search and anxiety as to when the task is complete.

Regional leaders, for money or to gain influence, retain caches of WMD and transfer some to terrorist groups.

Saddam attacks Israel with missiles containing weapons of mass destruction. Israel retaliates. Arab countries, notably Saudi Arabia and Jordan, come under intense political pressure to withdraw their support from the U.S. war effort. U.S. forces are forced to reposition operational centers into Iraq and Kuwait, complicating reconstruction and transition efforts.

OIL RESOURCES

Saddam sabotages a significant number of wells before his defeat. Current estimates indicate he may already have wired up to 1,500 of these wells. The damage takes years to contain at great economic and environmental cost and removes a major source of reconstruction funding.

Internal groups, such as the Kurds, seize oil-rich land before American troops reach the area, causing internal clashes over these resources. Militant Shi'as seize other wells in the South.

INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT

The United States takes immediate control of Iraq's administration and of reconstruction. The United Nations can't agree on how involved to get given the divisions among the Security Council about the need for conflict. The lack of UN involvement in the administration makes the European Union and others less likely to give. This situation delays reconstruction and puts more of the cost on the United States and a smaller number of partners.

U.S. reconstruction efforts that give U.S. corporations a great role at the expense of multilateral organizations and other participation—as was detailed in yesterday's Wall Street Journal—spur resentment and again limit the willingness of others to participate.

AMERICAN COMMITMENT

Stabilization and reconstruction prove more difficult than expected. U.S. troop requirements approach 200,000—the figure General Shinseki has mentioned—for a sustained period. This puts pressure on troop rotations, reservists, their families, and employers and requires a dramatic increase in end-strength.

Required funding reaches the figure suggested by a recent Council on Foreign Relations assessment—\$20 billion annually for several years. During a period of economic difficulty, the American public calls for greater burdensharing.

It is my hope that none of these eventualities comes to pass. But as you and all military leaders know, good planning requires considering the range of possibilities. It also requires advance preparation of the American people. You have regularly outlined the reasons for why the United States must disarm Iraq. I urge you to do the same in explaining why we must stay with Iraq for the long haul, even with the economic and military burdens this will entail.

As always, I am willing to help in any way I can to make this case to my colleagues and the American people.

Sincerely,

IKE SKELTON,
Ranking Democrat.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. I want to engage my colleague from Missouri in a colloquy.

There is no Member of this House who is more highly regarded in the area of national security than our friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON). I am privileged to be a native of the Show Me State, and he has done us all very proud.

I know at the end of the day he will want to support this resolution, Mr. Speaker, because this resolution does exactly, exactly what my friend just stated in his closing remarks: recognizing our troops.

Now, we had no intention of offending anyone in drafting the resolution. In fact, we thought it was so non-controversial that it would be an appropriate thing to move it forward.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I would have thought it a mere courtesy of saying, Would the gentleman from Missouri like to read this over and add or

make recommendations? I would love to have been there in order to support the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I completely understand that he would like to have had input; and that is one of the reasons we, in fact, did provide an opportunity, which is unusual, in consideration of this rule, for a motion to recommit for Members of the minority, if in fact that was the case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Atlanta, Georgia (Mr. LINDER), my very good friend and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Technology and the House of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of this rule and urge my colleagues to join me in approving this resolution.

H. Res. 561 will allow the House to work its will on the underlying resolution. It is an appropriate procedure, given the nature of H. Res. 557, which is a simple resolution. H. Res. 557 was introduced to recognize the Iraqi people's suffering under Saddam Hussein, the significant advancements being made in Iraq since last March, and the courage of U.S. and Coalition Forces as they strive to bring order and stability to the country.

The media is accurate in its reports of the difficulties that still face U.S. and Coalition Forces in Iraq. But there are also positive events taking place every day that deserve recognition and are largely ignored by the media. Probably the greatest accomplishment is that the Iraqis are returning to their lives and are enjoying freedoms that never could have existed under Saddam Hussein. Under his regime, the Iraqi lived in terror on a daily basis. Now, the people of Iraq have an opportunity to shape their history as they choose. The Iraqi people recently took their first step in shaping their future with the recent signing of the Iraqi interim constitution into law.

Other notable advancements in Iraq over the last year include the rise in oil production to roughly pre-March 2003 levels, the circulation of the new Iraqi currency, and the repair of critical infrastructure and roads. Additionally, the electricity supply has become more stable, and many Iraqi hospitals are up and running.

The number of Iraqis that have joined the Iraqi police force, border patrols, and army has also increased, allowing Iraqi citizens to participate in protection of their very own infrastructure.

Iraq is still a dangerous place, not only for Iraqi citizens but also for U.S. and Coalition Forces. I commend the U.S. and Coalition Forces for their dedication, sacrifice, and service in Iraq; and I salute them for helping to make our world a safer place.

The task of rebuilding Iraq will be no easy feat, and it will certainly take

time. However, I am encouraged by the positive events of the last year, and I believe it is in the U.S.'s interest and the world's to persevere and create a stable and democratic Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we may proceed to debate the underlying legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this closed rule because it works against the values and principles for which American citizens are risking their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan on this very day.

We are fighting for democracy abroad, but we will not allow democracy on the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States. The fact of the matter is, if this had not been a political document, every Member of this House would follow the line, "Commends the members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition Forces for liberating Iraq and expresses its gratitude for their valiant service." But that is not all that is in this resolution.

This is not about stopping consideration of the underlying resolution. It is a pleasure to take the time to pay tribute to the men and women who distinguish themselves daily in selfless service to this Nation. I do this, as do all Members on both sides of the aisle, at every available occasion. But there are other important matters that are not addressed in this resolution. And the fact that we were not included in its drafting allows them to be pronounced during the course of opposing this rule as well as in general debate.

We have not, for example, recognized the efforts of our National Guardsmen and Reserves, who have left friends and families and civilian jobs to serve in Iraq. But this completely closed rule does not give all Members of the House of Representatives the opportunity to commemorate the outstanding service of all those who have served in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Once this institution was considered one of the world's greatest deliberative bodies, and its Members were statespersons rather than professional self-promoters. Once Members of Congress were brimming with ideas befitting a proud democracy. But no more, Mr. Speaker. To all of my colleagues who showed up last night at the Committee on Rules with amendments that they thought could strengthen this resolution, I apologize to you for the majority's disdain for your contributions.

Actually, I had an amendment to this resolution that urged the President to provide Congress a straightforward and honest assessment of our past and future commitments in Iraq, as well as recognizing the selfless acts of the men and women in our service, who we all love and adore and applaud for their courage on a daily basis.

□ 1045

These are some of the many questions for which we are all seeking answers from the administration. Even

more, there are questions to which Congress has a constitutional responsibility and obligation to raise and demand answers.

Mr. Speaker, I asked myself last night as the Committee on Rules Republicans passed yet another closed rule, and 11 have been closed, 1 has been open this year, which stifles debate and shuts off meaningful contributions from all of the Members of this Chamber, I asked myself, What is the problem? The problem is that the majority has introduced this resolution for political reasons. C-SPAN will broadcast today's speeches and Fox News will run stories professing the patriotism of those on the other side of the aisle. Thus, the Republican majority hopes to disguise the neglect and misdirection they have shown in governing by not making this a bipartisan effort.

The Republicans have not established a record which helps all Americans, and are relying on photos ops and waving the American flag to get themselves reelected. It would be much more patriotic to address the perennially underfunded veterans affairs health care system. By the Bush administration's own estimate, their policies will exclude approximately 500,000 veterans from the VA health care system by 2005. This is shameful. President Bush also proposed an increase in pay fees and copayments in an effort to shift the burden onto the backs of veterans and drive an additional 1 million veterans from the system. It is shameful.

Our troops should be taken care of when we send them into battle, and be given the respect they have earned when we bring them home. America's veterans fight and fought for our freedoms, they should not have to fight for their benefits.

As the Republicans continue to protect the wealthy and act like show horses in front of the cameras, Democrats are working for the men and women in uniform and our veterans today as well as in the future. We will continue to applaud them.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is true that the United States of America has had a bipartisan foreign policy. This resolution is not about foreign policy. This resolution is not about foreign policy, this is a resolution that is simply designed to congratulate our troops. I do not understand why there is any controversy on it. As I said earlier and as I said in the Committee on Rules last night, we are sorry if anyone was offended over the fact that Members of the minority were not offered a chance to have input. I said to a number of my colleagues, that is one of the reasons that we have in fact made in order a motion to recommit that will allow the minority at the end of the bill an opportunity to cast a vote on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE)

who has done a phenomenal job of focusing on the rights of women. She chairs our Republican Conference and the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process Reform for the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I stand before Members to strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution for freedom and democracy in Iraq.

Life under Hussein's ruthless regime was unlike anything we have ever experienced. His cronies, in order to get information out of men, would rape their wives and their sisters and mothers. Women in Iraq frequently lost their husbands to "the law," never knowing what happened to them, where they went or why they were arrested. These same women, forbidden to go to work to support their families, were left to starvation.

The Iraqi women under Saddam Hussein's regime were someone's mothers, wives, and sisters, and they suffered tremendously. I led a women's delegation to Iraq and heard these atrocities firsthand from the women who now are free. They no longer dread the strong arm of Saddam Hussein's injustice. Coalition forces are now protecting the newly acquired rights of all Iraqis. I learned of the story of these two women who were protesting.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago they would have been executed for protesting. They were protesting to get the rights of women included in the Iraqi constitution. One of these women was waving her husband's death certificate saying, we have not waited all these years to be denied freedoms. A reporter, an Islamic reporter, went up to ask, Are you Sunni or Shiite? These women said, We may be one of each, but it is none of your business, we are Iraqis now.

That is what this is all about. This is what freedom stands for. This is what it means to two women, one who lost her husband and had no way of knowing what happened to him. This is what we are celebrating today. This is what has been accomplished by our Armed Forces, by the will of this administration.

Saddam Hussein, the ruthless murderer, is now in jail. He will be tried by his own people in his own country, and he will get his just rewards, and these two women, despite the fear and dread and horror of their past, will live in freedom. We should be very happy today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) who has fought aggressively for open rules on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the undemocratic, completely closed rule, and in opposition to House Resolution 557.

Mr. Speaker, like all of my colleagues, I have tremendous respect for the men and women of our Armed

Forces who are bearing the burden of this military action in Iraq. My support and my commitment to them and their families are unwavering. I will work to ensure that they remain the best trained, the best led, and the best equipped military force in the world. I am grateful and humbled by their courage, endurance and sacrifice, and I honor them not just today but every day, and I only wish this House was considering today a truly bipartisan resolution that properly honored our troops.

Unfortunately, once again this House is claiming to honor our troops without devoting the necessary resources for their safety or for their support. House Resolution 557 will do nothing to ensure that every one of our military personnel, including our National Guard and reservists serving on the front lines in Iraq will be fully equipped with the latest body armor. Instead, many families of our troops are buying and shipping that protection overseas to their loved ones, out of their own pockets with no hope for reimbursement. This is unacceptable, and we should fix it.

This resolution will do nothing to close the pay gap for our reservists and National Guard members who have been called away from their civilian jobs to serve in Iraq. Their families are struggling, going into debt as a result of their patriotic service. Yet the leadership of this House, unlike the other body, resists funding commonsense solutions to the problems caused by these overlong activations. This is unacceptable, and we should fix it.

This resolution contributes nothing towards fully funding our military construction needs so that all our military personnel have decent housing and facilities in which to live, train, and work. This is unacceptable, and we should fix it.

Mr. Speaker, I support our troops. I want to help the suffering people of Iraq live and prosper in a safe and secure nation. I want them to have the opportunity to choose their own government, one where every Iraqi may worship as he or she chooses, and every man, woman and child can live out their lives. But 1 year and \$120 billion later, we face continuing hostilities in Iraq, with no end in sight.

This resolution fails to mention that the war in Iraq was justified by this administration on the threat of weapons of mass destruction. Why? Because just like the experts tried to tell us for months before the war, we now know there are no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

I do not believe we needed to send over 150,000 American troops to Iraq to confirm that fact. Mr. Speaker, 566 soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines have died, and over 3,200 more have been wounded. Thousands of Iraqi men, women and children have perished, and scores of other civilians and nationals have been killed since we entered Iraq. There is no mention, no remembrance for them in this resolution.

Today the American taxpayer is still paying for almost all of the cost of Iraq without the least idea of how much the war has cost to date or how much it will cost in the future. In fact, the operations in Iraq are not even included in the President's budget. We still do not have a truly independent commission to provide a full accounting of the events leading up to the war and the nature of the intelligence of policy-making that led the Bush administration to go to war.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year later the United States is more isolated than ever in the world. Terrorist networks are proliferating, including new networks in Iraq and Europe. And our troops abroad and our first responders at home are overstretched, underfunded, and overburdened.

I am glad Saddam Hussein no longer has the power to torment the Iraqi people, but unlike the claim made in this resolution, I do not believe that the world is a safer, less dangerous place than it was 12 months ago.

This resolution is more about what the Republican leadership wants us to forget about the past year: the costs, the bloated contracts, no weapons, no ties to al Qaeda, the flawed intelligence, the wounded and the dead.

I urge all my colleagues to remember and vote against this undemocratic rule and vote against this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to simply say that again, we did not have a goal of offending Members on this. This is not about foreign policy, this is about commending our troops.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is 2½ pages long, okay. I am going to share with our colleagues the resolved clause.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives

(1) affirms that the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq;

(2) commends the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of unspeakable oppression and brutality inflicted on them by Saddam Hussein's regime;

(3) commends the Iraqi people on the adoption of Iraq's interim constitution; and

(4) commends the members of the U.S. Armed Forces and coalition forces for liberating Iraq and expresses its gratitude for their valiant service.

That is what this resolution is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), the very distinguished Chair of the Republican Study Committee.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

September 11, 2001, is a day that should be etched in the mind of every American, because that is the day that terrorists chose to attack America and that threat is still here. The primary function of our Federal Government is

to protect our citizens and we are doing our best to see that happens.

It is now 1 year since the coalition forces entered Iraq to free those people from Saddam Hussein's rule of terror. Freedom is flourishing and the Iraqi people know they are better off. However, terrorists are still doing everything they can to interrupt that and see that does not happen. The Iraqi people are in control of their destiny for the first time, and we are here today to encourage them in that effort, and we are here today to say thank you to our troops, all those men and women who have served in the past in this effort and who are serving now over there, giving of themselves and giving their lives so they can protect these freedoms that we all enjoy. We know the world is safer today without Saddam Hussein.

We must never forget 9/11 and that we are fighting over there so we do not have to fight the terrorists here at home. And no matter what the terrorists try to do, they need to be reminded that these colors do not run.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, if this is not about foreign policy, then how is it that the chairman of the jurisdictional foreign policy committee brought it to the Committee on Rules? If it is not about foreign policy, why is the language for the Iraqi Liberation Act of 1998 referenced in this resolution? If it is not about foreign policy, why is the mention of the 16 previously adopted United Nations Security Council resolutions in this matter? If it is not about foreign policy, why is the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution 2002 referenced in this resolution? The other side of the aisle is trying to defend the indefensible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, who may be able to tell us why it is not about foreign policy.

□ 1100

Mr. LANTOS. I want to thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote it down. I deeply regret that this resolution was not handled in a bipartisan manner. The Democratic side was not consulted on this resolution, and the Republican leadership bypassed its consideration before the Committee on International Relations. It is simply unacceptable that not a single amendment was made in order, no substitute is allowed; and there is no other way we on our side can offer improvements to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the country is at war. The men and women who serve are Democrats and Republicans and Independents. The men and women who are

wounded are Democrats and Republicans and Independents. And, yes, Mr. Speaker, the men and women who die are Democrats and Republicans and Independents. The families grieving are Democrats and Republicans and independents. Many of us have tried very hard for a long time to work towards a bipartisan foreign policy decades ago and certainly since September 11. The manner in which this resolution was crafted and the way in which it is being considered under this rule is a slap in the face of all those who have tried to conduct a bipartisan foreign policy in the national interest. You on your side have neither a monopoly on wisdom nor a monopoly on patriotism. You should have come to the Democrats to craft a resolution honoring our troops, which would have passed this body unanimously. You have created divisiveness at a time when we need cohesion and unity. You have created divisiveness for no reason except illusory partisan advantage. This is a flawed resolution, flawed in its presentation, flawed in its procedure, flawed in its partisanship. This is not a Republican tax bill to be handled only by Republicans. This is a bill of national importance. Democrats, Independents, and Republicans have a right to have an input, to say how much we admire the courage and patriotism of our troops. You have failed, and you have failed miserably.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the rule and to come forward with a reasonable resolution supported across the political spectrum in this body.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that my friend from California is one of the greatest patriots in this institution. I hold him in the highest regard. I believe very strongly in the need for us to pursue a bipartisan foreign policy. Let me just say that, again, we had no intention of offending anyone in the crafting of this resolution, and it should be a nonpartisan resolution itself. At the end of the day because we found that controversy came forward in the Committee on Rules last night beyond the request that was made by Chairman HYDE, we did in fact offer a motion to recommit for members of the minority.

But I do believe again that this resolution is designed to do nothing more than commend the troops and the people of Iraq. That is what it is designed to do. It has nothing to do with our foreign policy. This here marks the first anniversary of this very, very successful effort. I think that what we are trying to do here is, in a bipartisan way, acknowledges that.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend from Miami, Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART), an able member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time. I think it is appropriate on the 1-year anniversary of the liberation of Iraq

that we focus on that monumental and extraordinary event on the floor of this House today. The resolution before us congratulates the valiant men and women of the United States Armed Forces and the Coalition for having liberated the people of Iraq, and it states that because of that heroic effort by the Armed Forces of the Coalition and principally the United States, the world is safer today. The world is safer, Mr. Speaker.

Each time a dangerous madman is removed from power anywhere in the world, the entire world is safer because there is one less madman kidnapping power in a country and holding the entire people of that country hostage and linking with terrorist groups throughout the world. Saddam Hussein was not the only dangerous enemy of freedom and peace in the world; but he was a dangerous enemy of freedom and peace in the world, and the entire world is safer because Saddam Hussein is gone from power and facing justice. I would ask the people of Iraq if they feel safer after having seen the regime deposed or if they do not feel safer.

The entire world is safer and especially, I believe, Mr. Speaker, the people of Iraq are safer. Just like we can ask the people of Albania if they feel safer because Hoxha is no longer in power or in Romania because Ceausescu is no longer in power or in Russia because Stalin is no longer in power. I think that we should ask all those peoples if they believe that they are safer or not safer because their former totalitarian despots are no longer in power. Or ask the people in Cambodia if they feel safer because Pol Pot is no longer in power.

Each time a madman is removed from power, not only the people that that madman had kidnapped and was torturing and oppressing are safer, the entire world is safer. Or is it that when we talk about Iraq, Iraq is not on planet Earth? The entire world is safer, but especially the people of Iraq are safer and the American Armed Forces are the primary liberators of that people. They deserve the commendation and the admiration of the entire world and most especially of this House. That is why I thank the authors for having brought it forward at this important occasion, the 1-year anniversary of the liberation of Iraq.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The Chair will remind Members to refrain from trafficking the well while another Member is speaking.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say to my distinguished friend from Florida that I do not believe that the families of the people of Spain or Morocco or Turkey where bombs have gone off feel safer. So maybe they are in this world.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 3½ minutes to my good friend from California (Ms. HARMAN), the distinguished ranking member of the Perma-

nent Select Committee on Intelligence with whom I work regularly.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding me this time and commend him for his service in this Congress and particularly his excellent service on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate to consider a resolution on the eve of the Iraq war anniversary. I agree that the world has much to be glad about with the fall of Saddam Hussein and the end of his despotic regime. And I certainly hope that the Iraqi people will create a transparent, democratic form of government for the first time in their history, a chance that they have now that Saddam Hussein is no longer in power. I for one, and I believe this entire Congress, will stand by them and must stand by them and support them as they make this transition. We must stay the course.

But there is more to this subject on the first anniversary of the Iraq war than H. Res. 557 acknowledges. Much more. On the anniversary of our military action in Iraq, we need to be talking about more. That is why many of us wanted an open rule and certainly an open process so that we could contribute to the language contained in this resolution.

As ranking member of one of the key committees with jurisdiction over this subject, that is, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I would have welcomed the opportunity to share some of my ideas to fashion a great resolution which I believe would have passed this body unanimously. I consider myself a passionate bipartisan on questions of defense, national security, and intelligence; and I think that my ideas, if I had had a chance to communicate them, would have been accepted.

For example, I am one of many Members here who has visited Walter Reed to see the wounded from Iraq. These are very courageous kids. Thousands have been wounded. I would have liked us to acknowledge them and their courage.

I visited the families in my district who have lost family members in Iraq. I would have liked to acknowledge those losses and those families.

I have visited Iraq twice. Some have been there more. In addition to acknowledging our troops, I would have liked to acknowledge the intelligence community personnel who take such risks on our behalf and the civilians working selflessly there.

I worked in 1999 and 2000 as a member of the National Commission on Terrorism chaired by Jerry Bremer, Ambassador L. Paul Bremer. I might have liked to acknowledge him and his selfless service in Iraq.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me, and I will address this along with other Intelligence Committee members later in the debate, that I would have liked to acknowledge the important

role that intelligence products play in force protection now in Iraq and why those products need to be better. In my view, Mr. Speaker, and I think many would share this, good intelligence is a force protection issue.

And so it seems to me on the first anniversary of our action in Iraq that we should acknowledge the need for better intelligence products and the need for this administration to fix right now, not next year but right now, the way we source and analyze intelligence. That is a suggestion I also would have made on a bipartisan basis if I had been permitted to participate.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that as we commemorate the first anniversary of the action in Iraq, we need actions and not just words.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who also had an amendment that would have strengthened this matter had it been permitted by the Committee on Rules.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me just thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time and for his strong leadership on each and every committee on which he has served.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and this resolution. This resolution really is an affront and an insult to our troops. I tried to offer an amendment to this very deceptive resolution. My amendment just basically expressed deep sorrow and real support for all of those who have been killed in this war and we extended support for their families in my amendment.

As the daughter of a career military officer, Mr. Speaker, I know how important this is and what this means. This resolution as it is written never even mentions the over 550 Americans who have died. How insulting and insensitive. It does not even mention the Iraqi civilians and all of our international friends who have died in this war. My amendment also stated that the war in Iraq has undermined our alliances, it has cost hundreds of Americans and unknown numbers of Iraqi lives and billions of dollars, and it has made the world a more dangerous place rather than a safer place. The evidence speaks for itself on that. We are not voting on my amendment today because once again the Republican-controlled Committee on Rules did not allow any amendments, not only my amendment but zero, none, they did not allow. Once again true debate is being stifled. What a shame and disgrace. As an officer of the Congressional Black Caucus, we continue to stand in full support of our troops, in support of our veterans and their health benefits, and in support of their economic security. This resolution does none of this. None of this.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule. I urge them to vote "no" on this resolution. Remember, this is part of a pattern of deception which we have

seen from day one. We are talking about not only the intelligence information that was not there but really a whole host of deceptive measures that have come before this body that we have voted on. I hope we vote "no" on this resolution. It is wrong. It is terrible.

□ 1115

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Brentwood, Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), a very able new Member of this body.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule because I think it is a fair rule for a worthy resolution. And like a lot of my constituents, I have spent time reflecting on what September 11 and the war in Iraq has meant to our country, how terrorism affects our lives, and what all of this means in the context of our world community, and I have come to the conclusion that as complicated as our world is and as tangled as the diplomacy surrounding our economic and military ties with the rest of the world become, I know that there are certain basic truths. And one of the great basic truths is the constant struggle between good and evil. And there are times in our history when the struggle is very clear, and today we are at one of those moments of such clarity. The lines are drawn, and we know who is aligned on each side.

America leads a fight that we did not seek against a movement founded on distorted religious views and failed nations. This resolution marks a victory for good, and it is so very important that when good triumphs and advances that we celebrate that victory.

This resolution honors our men and women in uniform. They have made the world a safer place for our children, and there are fewer greater gifts than that. And today we are welcoming the Iraqi people into the community of free nations. The resolution says to the world that America was willing to take on this fight to dedicate the fruits of her labor to free a horribly, horribly oppressed people a world away. Iraqi success in rebuilding and being free is our greatest weapon against terrorism. Terrorism seeks to destroy. Freedom builds. And that is why we are in Afghanistan and why we are in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our troops, I thank our families, and the communities that have supported them. And may God bless America.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is going to be a motion for an adjournment vote here, and I just wanted to, before we proceed with that, inquire how many speakers the gentleman has remaining for the debate as we prepare to go into this.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Three and possibly four, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 36, noes 377, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

AYES—36

Abercrombie	Hinchey	Sánchez, Linda
Allen	Holt	T.
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Conyers	Kilpatrick	Sanders
Cummings	McDermott	Schakowsky
DeGette	McGovern	Shimkus
Delahunt	Miller (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Dicks	Oliver	Tierney
Dingell	Owens	Waters
Doggett	Payne	Wexler
Emanuel	Pelosi	Woolsey
Filner	Rothman	
Hastings (FL)	Roybal-Allard	

NOES—377

Ackerman	Capito	Fattah
Aderholt	Capps	Feeney
Akin	Cardin	Ferguson
Alexander	Cardoza	Flake
Andrews	Carson (IN)	Foley
Baca	Carson (OK)	Forbes
Bachus	Carter	Ford
Baird	Case	Fossella
Baker	Castle	Franks (AZ)
Baldwin	Chabot	Frelinghuysen
Ballance	Chandler	Gallegly
Ballenger	Chocola	Garrett (NJ)
Barrett (SC)	Clyburn	Gephardt
Bartlett (MD)	Coble	Gerlach
Barton (TX)	Cole	Gibbons
Bass	Collins	Gilchrest
Beauprez	Cooper	Gillmor
Becerra	Costello	Gingrey
Bell	Cox	Gonzalez
Bereuter	Cramer	Goode
Berkley	Crane	Goodlatte
Berman	Crenshaw	Gordon
Berry	Crowley	Goss
Biggert	Cubin	Granger
Bilirakis	Culberson	Graves
Bishop (GA)	Cunningham	Green (TX)
Bishop (NY)	Davis (AL)	Green (WI)
Bishop (UT)	Davis (CA)	Greenwood
Blackburn	Davis (FL)	Grijalva
Blumenauer	Davis (IL)	Gutierrez
Blunt	Davis (TN)	Gutknecht
Boehlert	Davis, Jo Ann	Hall
Boehner	Davis, Tom	Harman
Bonilla	Deal (GA)	Harris
Bonner	DeFazio	Hart
Bono	DeLauro	Hastings (WA)
Boozman	DeLay	Hayes
Boswell	DeMint	Hayworth
Boucher	Deutsch	Hefley
Boyd	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hensarling
Bradley (NH)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Henger
Brady (PA)	Dooley (CA)	Hill
Brady (TX)	Doolittle	Hinojosa
Brown (OH)	Doyle	Hobson
Brown (SC)	Dreier	Hoekstra
Brown, Corrine	Duncan	Holden
Brown-Waite,	Dunn	Honda
Ginny	Edwards	Hooley (OR)
Burgess	Ehlers	Hostettler
Burns	Emerson	Houghton
Burr	Engel	Hoyer
Burton (IN)	English	Hulshof
Buyer	Eshoo	Hyde
Calvert	Etheridge	Inslee
Camp	Evans	Isakson
Cannon	Everett	Issa
Cantor	Farr	Istook

Jackson (IL)	Miller (FL)	Schrock
Jackson-Lee	Miller (MI)	Scott (GA)
(TX)	Miller, Gary	Scott (VA)
Jenkins	Miller, George	Sensenbrenner
John	Mollohan	Serrano
Johnson (CT)	Moore	Sessions
Johnson (IL)	Moran (KS)	Shadegg
Johnson, Sam	Moran (VA)	Shaw
Jones (NC)	Murphy	Shays
Jones (OH)	Murtha	Sherman
Kanjorski	Musgrave	Sherwood
Kaptur	Myrick	Shuster
Keller	Nadler	Simmons
Kelly	Napolitano	Simpson
Kennedy (MN)	Neal (MA)	Skelton
Kennedy (RI)	Nethercutt	Slaughter
Kildee	Neugebauer	Smith (MI)
Kind	Ney	Smith (NJ)
King (IA)	Northup	Smith (TX)
Kingston	Norwood	Snyder
Kirk	Nunes	Solis
Klecza	Nussle	Spratt
Kline	Oberstar	Stark
Knollenberg	Obey	Stearns
Kolbe	Ortiz	Stenholm
LaHood	Osborne	Strickland
Lampson	Ose	Stupak
Langevin	Otter	Sullivan
Lantos	Oxley	Sweeney
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Tancred
Larson (CT)	Pascarell	Tanner
Latham	Pastor	Tauscher
LaTourette	Paul	Taylor (MS)
Leach	Pearce	Taylor (NC)
Lee	Pence	Terry
Levin	Peterson (MN)	Thomas
Lewis (CA)	Peterson (PA)	Thompson (CA)
Lewis (GA)	Petri	Thornberry
Lewis (KY)	Pickering	Tiahrt
Linder	Pitts	Tiberi
Lipinski	Platts	Toomey
LoBiondo	Pombo	Towns
Lofgren	Pomeroy	Turner (OH)
Lowe	Porter	Turner (TX)
Lucas (KY)	Portman	Udall (CO)
Lucas (OK)	Price (NC)	Udall (NM)
Majette	Pryce (OH)	Upton
Manzullo	Putnam	Van Hollen
Markey	Radanovich	Velázquez
Marshall	Rahall	Visclosky
Matheson	Ramstad	Vitter
Matsui	Rangel	Walder (OR)
McCarthy (MO)	Regula	Wamp
McCarthy (NY)	Rehberg	Watson
McCollum	Renzi	Watt
McCotter	Rodriguez	Waxman
McCrery	Rogers (AL)	Weiner
McHugh	Rogers (KY)	Weldon (FL)
McInnis	Rogers (MI)	Weldon (PA)
McIntyre	Rohrabacher	Weller
McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
McNulty	Ross	Wicker
Meehan	Royce	Wilson (NM)
Meek (FL)	Ruppersberger	Wilson (SC)
Meeks (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Wolf
Menendez	Ryun (KS)	Wu
Mica	Sabo	Wynn
Michaud	Sandlin	Young (AK)
Millender-	Saxton	Young (FL)
McDonald	Schiff	

NOT VOTING—20

Clay	King (NY)	Rush
Frank (MA)	Kucinich	Ryan (OH)
Frost	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Hoefel	Maloney	Souder
Hunter	Quinn	Tauzin
Israel	Reyes	Walsh
Jefferson	Reynolds	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1142

Messrs. SIMPSON, WICKER, MCCOTTER, GREEN of Texas, SHAYS, WELLER, SHUSTER, LUCAS of Oklahoma, NEUGEBAUER, KINGSTON, SULLIVAN, HEFLEY, LARSON of Connecticut, CALVERT, JOHN, WOLF, LUCAS of Kentucky, and EHLERS, and Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. HART, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mrs.